[960073] [941019]

A SECRETARY'S RECOLLECTIONS OF ERWIN PANOFSKY

Roxanne S. Heckscher

Interviewed by Richard Cándida Smith

Art History Oral Documentation Project

Compiled under the Auspices
of the
Getty Center for the History of
Art and the Humanities

Copyright © 1995
The J. Paul Getty Trust

COPYRIGHT LAW

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Assistant Director for Resource Collections of the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities.

* * *

Frontispiece: Roxanne S. Heckscher and William S. Heckscher, 1982.
Photograph by Grace Goldin, courtesy of Roxanne S. Heckscher.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to Richard Cándida Smith for his very skillful and penetrating questions in guiding me through this interview on Erwin Panofsky. My thanks also to Katherine P. Smith for the wonderful editorial work done by her. My husband, William S. Heckscher, has been at my side as I reviewed the original draft.

Roxanne S. Heckscher

CONTENTS

Biographical Summary vii

SESSION ONE: 20 MAY, 1994 (120 minutes)

TAPE I, SIDE ONE 1

Family background — Growing up in New York City — Attending Hunter College with a major in English and a minor in music history — Employment after college: the State Department and public relations — In 1957, Heckscher responds to an ad in the *New York Times* for "Secretary to art historian" at the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) — Unusual job interview — First meeting with Erwin Panofsky — Heckscher's art history survey course at Hunter College — Advantages of having worked in the State Department — Predecessor at IAS — Devising a new system for organizing footnotes — Taking dictation of text for *Renaissance and Renascences* — Panofsky's working methods — Daily routine in the office — Answering correspondence had first priority — Panofsky's English reminiscent of a character from a Henry James novel — Panofsky's mastery of vocabulary and style — His desire for his work to be accessible to the layperson — His directive to Heckscher to tear his sentences apart — Dictating from notes and drafts prepared on yellow pads at home — Panofsky's writing usually went through only one draft — His conclusions became bolder toward the end of his life — Panofsky enjoyed reviewing galleys and proofs and ordering illustrations himself — Panofsky's gift as an extemporaneous speaker — Heckscher's disappointment with his formal lecturing style — More on the process of dictation and the relation of the stenographic record to Panofsky's original notes — Transcribing tapes of Panofsky's lectures at the Institute of Fine Arts — Working on *Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic* — Panofsky's approach to library research — His small personal library — Heckscher's good working relationship with Panofsky — Panofsky's personality.

TAPE I, SIDE TWO 20

Working for Felix Gilbert during Panofsky's "fallow periods" — Difficulty of dividing workday between Panofsky and Gilbert — Panofsky's desire to impress others with images of an aristocratic background — Panofsky in awe of Robert Oppenheimer — More on Panofsky's prose style — Dora Panofsky — Panofsky's love of music — Indications of intellectual competition between Dora and her husband — Gerda Panofsky — Panofsky's guilt over his return to Germany to accept the *Pour le mérite* — Panofsky's feeling about burial ceremonies — His friendship with Kantorowicz — Panofsky's relationship with his sons — On Dora's claim that she never kissed her sons — Dora's masculine style of dress and short hair — More on Panofsky's daily working methods — His assumption of the intelligence of others and their ability to understand him — Panofsky's sense of humor and his style of praise — His friendships with Harold Cherniss, Rosalie Green, and Hetty Goldman — His relations with other IAS scholars — Panofsky's love of films and Georges Simenon's mystery novels — Luncheons at the Panofsky house — Description of Panofsky's house and its furnishings.

TAPE II, SIDE ONE 39

Panofsky interested in iconography rather than in art works themselves — More on his house — Panofsky's love of dogs — His sartorial style and his habits — More on dictation and the preparation of footnotes — Panofsky's index card file system — His work on the Flight into Egypt ends after his notes are lost in a fire — Smoking and drinking habits — Falling for women who looked like Dora — How Roxanne Heckscher came to meet her husband — Work at IAS after Panofsky's death — Heckscher's decision to retire in 1991 — Heckscher compares her work experience in the private business world with her work at the IAS — Impressions of the Princeton community.

Index 49

Richard Cándida Smith, Assistant Professor of History at the University of Michigan, interviewed Roxanne S. Heckscher at her home in Princeton, New Jersey. A total of 2 hours were recorded. The transcript was edited by Katherine P. Smith.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

PLACE AND DATE OF BIRTH:

New York City, 13 October, 1926.

EDUCATION:

Hunter College, New York City. Major in English literature. Minor in music history.

MARRIAGE:

William S. Heckscher, 1973; one daughter, Charlotte.

CAREER:

State Department, Washington D.C. Secretary, 1955-1957.

Public Relations, New York City. Secretary to Curtis J. Hoxter, 1957.

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Secretary to Erwin Panofsky, 1957-1968. Secretary to Felix Gilbert, 1968-1989.

SESSION ONE: 20 MAY, 1994

[Tape I, Side One]

SMITH: The question we always start with is, When and where were you born?

HECKSCHER: I was born in New York City on October 13, 1926, which makes me sixty-seven at this point. My parents were Armenian, born in Turkey. They migrated to the United States, one in 1919 and the other in 1921.

SMITH: Had they both experienced the genocide?

HECKSCHER: They both had, although my mother was pretty well insulated from it. She had left her parental home and gone to Constantinople, where she worked for a wealthy family, and then she migrated to the United States with her brother and sister. I was educated of course in New York City and I went to Hunter College.

SMITH: So you went through the public school system?

HECKSCHER: I went through the public school system and then to Hunter, which was at that time an all girls [college]. My major was English literature and my minor was music history. I worked in New York for a while, then I worked at the State Department.

SMITH: Oh, in Washington?

HECKSCHER: In Washington. From there I came back to New York and worked for a public relations man, in international relations. I found him rather

crazy, so during the lunch hour I started to look through the *New York Times* want ads, and I saw this ad which said, "Secretary to Art Historian, Institute for Advanced Study. Call collect." I lived in Georgetown when I was in Washington and I loved it, and somehow I'd had it with New York, and I thought, "Well, this is not a bad idea. I'll try it and see what happens." So I called up and they gave me an appointment for a Saturday. It was raining cats and dogs.

SMITH: Now, what year was this?

HECKSCHER: This was in 1957. I was told to see a Mrs. Barnett, and when I appeared at the Institute the switchboard was closed and the main lobby was full of young and old men reading their newspapers on these sticks. I thought, "What a strange place. There's nobody to answer questions." Suddenly a man emerged and asked if he could help me, and I said, "Yes, I have an appointment with Mrs. Barnett." He said, "Well, I'll call her." She had completely forgotten about the appointment. This was, I guess, in November.

She finally came, and I have never had an interview like this. She offered me booze during the interview. [laughter] I was ready to be asked all sorts of questions, given tests—none of that. She did ask some questions, and she had an uncanny ability to assess people. I refused the drink of course, but she proceeded to drink. After I had passed her particular screening she called [Erwin] Panofsky

on the phone and he emerged in her office wearing what I suppose you'd call a greatcoat—it was tweed. He asked me to follow him into his office and he was quite cordial. He gave me a picture to identify and I can't even remember what it was now.

SMITH: Some sort of old master?

HECKSCHER: Yes, and he asked me about my background of course, and the idea of my having been an English literature major appealed to him. One of the first questions he asked me was, "Do you know any Latin?" I said, "Well, I've had two years of college Latin, but it's rolled off my back." After this interview he said to me, "Well, between my broken English and your broken Latin I think we will get along." And that was the beginning.

SMITH: Had you had any art history education?

HECKSCHER: I only had what was required at Hunter, which was a survey course, and it was dreadful because, well, there were something like four hundred students in this survey, and all we saw was slides being put on, but the instructor was very good. As a matter of fact, I think his name was Davies. He was at Rutgers for a while. But that was the extent of [my art history], and in a way this was to my advantage, because if I had known of Panofsky's fame, it might have intimidated me. You know, I'd met all sorts of people in the State Department, so it was very easy for me to meet "name" people, but I think I

would have been intimidated if I had been an art history major.

SMITH: So you packed up and moved down to Princeton?

HECKSCHER: Well, I told Panofsky that I would have to give my employer a month's notice, so I continued to work in New York—it was a Madison Avenue outfit—and in that interim he must have called me three times. He was afraid that I wouldn't come. I later found out that nobody thought I would stay.

SMITH: Really?

HECKSCHER: It's very interesting. Of course, because I worked in Washington I had to dress in a particular way, so I came to the interview wearing black alligator shoes and a black suit, and Princeton is a very casual town. They probably thought, "Oh, she's a typical New York type. She's not going to enjoy this." Well, it turned out that I was ready for it, and I went casual.

SMITH: Did you have a family at the time?

HECKSCHER: No, no. I was single. I guess I was between thirty and thirty-one.

SMITH: Did you come right after Christmas, or New Year's?

HECKSCHER: I think it was a little bit before Christmas, because the Institute always gave everybody Christmas holiday for a whole week. I had hardly worked for a few days when I had a whole week off. [laughter]

SMITH: Did Panofsky have a special project gearing up at that time?

HECKSCHER: I'll tell you what happened. Panofsky's previous secretary was clearly very scholarly and very well educated; she had a Ph.D. I don't know how long she'd worked for him, but he told me that she had had a nervous breakdown, and that this had happened in the middle of *Renaissance and Renascences* [*in Western Art* (1960)]. One of the first things that he said to me was, "It was my footnotes that did it." Of course he was being funny, but he said, "How are you going to handle my footnotes?" I said, "Well, I will put your text in one notebook, and the footnotes in a second notebook." And that's the way I did it. I was later to discover some of the stenography pads of the person preceding me and the text and the footnotes were all in the same notebook so that you couldn't separate the footnote from the text. I can see where it would cause tremendous confusion. Although probably for that person it shouldn't have, because that was her system. But for me it would have been dreadfully confusing.

SMITH: So he was still working on *Renaissance and Renascences*?

HECKSCHER: Yes, and that's what we completed. He had endless projects, there was hardly ever a time when he didn't. But that was a largish book and there were passages that I discovered had been repeated several times. I don't know how it happened, and of course in those days—this was '57, '58 almost—what was used was one of these old Royal typewriters. There were no

computers; you had to redo everything.

SMITH: So your first job was to prepare the manuscript to send to the publisher?

HECKSCHER: No, the book was not completed, you see. He hadn't totally completed the dictation of it.

SMITH: So he would dictate books?

HECKSCHER: Oh, yes. He used yellow legal-sized pads and it would all be done in his handwriting at his home. *Renaissance and Renascences* must have been completed as far as these yellow pads were concerned. That was the first thing he did. Then he would come in about ten thirty in the morning and he'd say, "Come into my parlor." We'd go in and the first thing he did was open his mail. He did this with great excitement, and he was very speedy about it. He would proceed to answer everything he could, and most of the time it was a great deal.

SMITH: He'd dictate correspondence to you?

HECKSCHER: Yes. That was the first thing he got out of the way, and he did it on a daily basis. Nothing was carried over to the next day except things he had to research. So very often he'd get a letter and the dictation would turn out almost to be an article.

SMITH: How did you handle the Latin and the Greek?

HECKSCHER: Well, and the Italian. [laughter] He gave me a book by Laurence Schmeckebier, *A Handbook of Italian Renaissance Painting*, and that book was supposed to help me with the spelling of any name in Italian art that possibly I didn't know. Very often he would spell out the Latin, and other foreign phrases or terms. But I remember the very, very first day that I worked for him he was answering a letter, and this was to be my first presentation of how I would produce work for him. He started to dictate a letter, and it was all about Carl Jung and art history. You see, he would dictate at ten thirty and then he would come back around four thirty to sign the mail. He was very fussy about this kind of thing; it had to go out the day that he dictated it. And when he came in at four thirty he started laughing when he read this Carl Jung letter. He had dictated "Carl Jung's art-historical observations" and I had typed "art-hysterical." [laughter] He thought this was hilarious. He didn't change it; he made a little asterisk and then he put some funny remark at the bottom of the page and that's the way he sent that thing off.

SMITH: But you had heard it as "art-hysterical"?

HECKSCHER: I don't know if I heard it as "art-hysterical," but the transcription of "art-hysterical" and "-historical" is very close, and as far as I was concerned "Jung's art-hysterical" would make sense to me. [laughter]

SMITH: Okay. Now were you taking down the dictation in shorthand?

HECKSCHER: Yes. He didn't dictate into a machine. I think he quite liked having somebody there taking it down.

SMITH: Would you correct his grammar?

HECKSCHER: His English was superb. Possibly people would disagree with me on this, but my feeling about his English was that it had been perfected through reading and not by conversation. It often reminded me of the way I would think Henry James would talk, except it was almost like Henry James translated into German and retranslated back into English. But his English was superb, and his grasp of grammar was infallible. So that was not the problem.

SMITH: And his vocabulary?

HECKSCHER: His vocabulary was fantastic. He knew all of these languages. He had a very keen interest in language and style. But I remember, after he would finish an article or a book or passages of a book, he would then say, "Tear me apart." This was very interesting to me, because I think it's very difficult for people to take criticism about their own writing. He liked the idea that I was not an art historian, in a sense. He wanted these books or articles to make sense to the intelligent, educated layman who was not an art historian. So he'd say, "Tear me apart."

He [used] a certain German construction in his sentences, and he was very funny, because I'd say to him, "Is it your German?" And he'd say, "No, it's my

Latin!" [laughter] This was a little conceit. The verbs would come all the way at the end of the sentence, and I would find that annoying, but it wasn't just that; it was also the fact that he loved detective stories, so, you see, he wanted to keep that suspense. At least this is my reading of Pan. So with the two things in combination, sometimes you would get such a complex sentence that it could end up being a whole paragraph. Very often I would make that one sentence into three or four, when I felt it was warranted, and I would certainly move his verbs up. [laughter] And he'd say to me, "You see? I am not stubborn." But I thought, "I don't know that I would have been able to take somebody like me tearing my sentences apart like that." He would argue when he felt it was warranted and it was his good right.

SMITH: He wouldn't just change it back unilaterally, he would argue?

HECKSCHER: You see, again, it's to his credit. He always knew that if I was questioning something, something was wrong, whether my explanation of it was correct or not. Very often my explanation probably didn't make much sense, but he knew that something there had to be corrected. He was extremely intelligent about accepting this, and his manner of going about it was amazing.

SMITH: You were saying that he would bring in these yellow legal pads with his notes. Were they notes or drafts for his books and articles?

HECKSCHER: Well, they were what he would call the "first draft." The idea

was, he would work at this at home, write it out in longhand and he would dictate it to me. Sometimes he had difficulty reading his own handwriting. After taking dictation on his letters I would then proceed to the text of an article or book. Then, after he signed his letters and sent them off, he would take home whatever I had typed out for that day and he would go over it, and then I would go over it, and we'd discuss it.

SMITH: So you had two copies?

HECKSCHER: The draft was always done on canary yellow paper, which wasn't the best quality, but it didn't need to be. The drafts were all triple-spaced so that Panofsky had room to make insertions, and after his insertions were made I would review the whole thing, and then he would incorporate my suggestions if he agreed, and then it would have to go through the final typing. Now, Pan was unusual, I think, because his writing would go through only one draft, and then it was the final. So it was just a question of typing out that first draft, triple-spaced, and then making whatever corrections he wanted and incorporating whatever suggestions I made about deletions or placing things in a different position. Then, finally, when it was finished, if it was a chapter I would just retype it and that was the end. Unlike a lot of other scholars, who would agonize even at the last minute about sending something to the publisher or making more changes, Panofsky never bothered after that.

SMITH: If he was writing all the time, he must have been producing a lot.

HECKSCHER: Well, it was incredible. I can't really tell you what followed *Renaissance and Renascences*, I can't remember, but it was just a constant flow. I came in late '57, and for three years he had something going all the time. During the time that William [Heckscher, husband] came, in the academic year 1960-1961, Panofsky said he had a fallow period, so at that point he asked if I could help William out. But Panofsky's fallow period didn't last long.

I worked for him for eleven years, from '57 to '68, when he died. Of course there was *Tomb Sculpture* [*: Four Lectures on Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini* (1964)], but for the most part they were articles, and you know, I think he got bolder and bolder toward the end, but the argumentation was always interesting.

SMITH: Would you discuss with him more than just the written style? Would you say, "Your argument doesn't make sense to me here at this point"?

HECKSCHER: No, that I didn't do, because I felt this was not my business.

SMITH: So you kept primarily to English language and style?

HECKSCHER: I stuck to the English language. If I felt there was a glaring illogicality somewhere, I would point it out and say, "I think it would be better if you said this, and put this statement three sentences down." But no, I would never argue about the content. That was not my job.

SMITH: You weren't hired to be an editor for him in any way?

HECKSCHER: Well, I wasn't, but that's the way it ended, because he really didn't have an editor. I did what I could, then he'd look it over and I guess he considered then that all he had to do was look at it himself and that was it.

SMITH: Did you work with him also when galleys or proofs would come back?

HECKSCHER: No, that he did on his own, and I think he quite enjoyed it.

SMITH: What about the selection and preparation of illustrations? That's a lot of work.

HECKSCHER: It is a lot of work, but he had these places in Italy and he would order some of his photographs from them, or wherever. He did the ordering himself.

SMITH: Would you get insights into the sorts of intellectual puzzles that were bothering Panofsky while you were working with him?

HECKSCHER: No.

SMITH: So by the time you got it, he had figured out what he wanted to say.

HECKSCHER: Oh, sure.

SMITH: Did you work on *Pandora's Box* [*: The Changing Aspects of a Mythical Symbol* (1956)]?

HECKSCHER: No, that I wasn't in on. I forget when that was first published and then it was redone.

SMITH: The second edition was in 1962. *Tomb Sculpture* was '64.

HECKSCHER: Well, yes, of course *Tomb Sculpture* started out as a series of lectures at NYU [1956]. It's amazing how one does forget. My impression about *Tomb Sculpture* . . . now wait a moment. I'm just not sure any longer, but the thing that I'm coming to is really this: while he always dictated everything, it seems to me that after he gave these series of talks at NYU—and it was *Tomb Sculpture*—he came back with the tapes. I think the talks were recorded there. Or maybe he dictated *Tomb Sculpture*; I'm not clear on it any longer. I know that recordings were made when he was speaking and I have never found out what happened to those.

SMITH: This seems to be a feature of the way he worked because he would have these notes that he would read out, which may or may not be polished drafts.

HECKSCHER: Well, it sounded polished of course when he dictated it, but it was just a question of editing and taking things out.

SMITH: But this oral presentation was an important part of his writing process, whether it was to you or to an audience; he had to speak it out to somebody.

HECKSCHER: I just don't know. It's so interesting because—this is just a little aside—I went to a Panofsky lecture in New York, I think it was at the Metropolitan, and I was struck by the fact that I was disappointed in the

presentation, because he was such a good speaker extemporaneously. You know, if he explained something it was absolutely marvelous. It would just flow out, this enthusiasm with which he spoke. Very often he would have difficulty reading his text, which was handwritten. I remember going to one lecture where he said, "I can't read my notes." I mean, he simply was at a loss; he couldn't figure out what he'd written. His handwriting was a nice handwriting, but sometimes not easily read.

SMITH: I'm interested in this process [by which] his writing and the oral dictation seem to work together to [produce] the first draft of his work. Did you look at those yellow pads?

HECKSCHER: No.

SMITH: So he had the yellow pads and then he would dictate to you from those?

HECKSCHER: He would dictate to me from the yellow pad and sometimes he couldn't make out a particular word. Of course it didn't matter when he was dictating, but in the lecture hall he was quite open about it.

SMITH: It's interesting because when it was just the two of you, theoretically he could have just given you the yellow pad and said, "I know you'll have difficulty with some of this."

HECKSCHER: I've never really thought about that, but no, he always read from it. I never had anything to do with his yellow pad.

SMITH: Do you get a feeling that he was changing and improvising and perhaps extending while he was dictating?

HECKSCHER: No, I did not get that feeling at all. I had the feeling that he was simply reading exactly what he had.

SMITH: I guess the curious thing to me then, is why didn't he just give you the yellow pads and then have you type them up? What was the function for him of doing the dictation?

HECKSCHER: He probably didn't think that I could read from his pad. I think that certainly was the greater part of it. It's possible that he needed an audience when he was dictating, I don't know. It doesn't really make very much sense to me, because I was not an audience from whom he was getting any feedback. My function was to take the dictation.

SMITH: Well, it does raise the question of whether there was something going on in the oral translation that amplified the text in some way.

HECKSCHER: I don't really think so.

SMITH: Did he preserve the yellow pads?

HECKSCHER: Oh, always. Maybe they're in the archives. I don't know what Gerda [Panofsky] did with those, but they were certainly at his desk. They were on a long table in his office, and it's possible that Gerda gave them to the National Archives, because I know she gave quite a bit to them.

SMITH: *Saturn and Melancholy* [*: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art* (1964)] is another book that came out while you were working for him. Does that ring a bell?

HECKSCHER: No.

SMITH: What about *Problems in Titian* [*, Mostly Iconographic* (1969)]?

HECKSCHER: Oh yes. I'm very unclear about this. [As I mentioned], there was a point at which I was transcribing from a dictaphone machine directly onto the typewriter. [I thought it was *Tomb Sculpture*], but it [now] seems to me that it had something to do with the Titian lectures. I bring this up because in the middle of doing this the dictaphone machine was stolen. Of course it would have been nice to have Pan's voice, and the thing was stolen not because this had been done by Pan, but probably the person who took it sold the machine just for a few dollars. This happened over a weekend, when I think there was a director's meeting at the Institute. There had been a rash of thefts at the Institute around that time. [The lecture which was still in the dictaphone had to be dictated to me by Pan. I expect that NYU may have some of the tapes.]

SMITH: But if he gave a series of lectures, then he did not have you type up the lectures before he delivered them?

HECKSCHER: This is what I'm trying to ferret out, because this is where my memory fails. I'm not clear on it, but there must have been a reason for me to

be transcribing it, so I think that possibly what he did was read the lectures from his own notes while they were being recorded on these tapes and then he brought the tapes to me.

SMITH: Was this common?

HECKSCHER: No, it was the only time.

SMITH: So you think it was probably [*Problems in Titian*]?

HECKSCHER: This is what I'm thinking it was, but my memory, as I say, is [such that] I can't really vouch for it.

SMITH: Well, I'm interested more in the process than in the specifics. So the tapes were stolen along with the machine?

HECKSCHER: Yes, unfortunately, but I don't think all of the tapes were stolen, only the one in the dictaphone machine. I'm a little bit confused because I know that recordings were made at NYU, and what happened to those I don't know.

SMITH: Well, it's possible they had the recordings and they gave him copies. There were a couple of other [books I wanted to ask you about]. What about *The Codex Huyghens and Leonardo da Vinci's Art Theory* [1968]?

HECKSCHER: Gee, how strange. I just don't remember. It's gone.

SMITH: Well, I'm sure there was a lot of stuff. *The Iconography of Correggio's Camera di San Paolo* [1961]?

HECKSCHER: Yes.

SMITH: Do you have any recollections of his process while working on that?

HECKSCHER: No, but I was thinking the other day, it seemed to me that during the time I worked for Panofsky, he would go to the library himself, but if he did he never spent too much time there. He knew exactly where to look for whatever it was he was looking for, and then he'd be out in no time. He didn't pore over things for hours in the library. And my impression was that he didn't have a huge personal library. Most of the books were probably books that had been sent to him. So he certainly availed himself of libraries in his earlier years, but it seems to me that when I worked for him he wasn't spending all that much time in the library.

SMITH: Did he have graduate assistants or research assistants?

HECKSCHER: No, he did not have a research assistant, at least not in my time.

SMITH: Now, it does appear that many of the things that he published in the last decade of his life were things that he had been working on or had begun many years earlier—sometimes a decade or two earlier. Did you have a sense that he was pulling out from his files incomplete work and finishing it?

HECKSCHER: I never had that sense.

SMITH: So you had a sense that everything was fresh with him?

HECKSCHER: I did.

SMITH: What about his general personal characteristics? What kind of a man

was he, just as a human being, to work with?

HECKSCHER: I had been told when I was hired that he was very difficult to work for. I did not find this to be so. Now, whether it was just a question of our personalities meshing, I don't know, but he was not difficult. I found him very reasonable. I think at times he annoyed me, because . . . well, there was a kind of snobbishness in him that irritated me.

SMITH: Snobbishness directed towards you, or just in general?

HECKSCHER: No, it had nothing to do with me; it was in general. He would say to me things like, "All my friends are noblemen." This doesn't wash very well with an American. [laughter] It was telling me something about him. And yet, as much as those things irritated me at times, the warmth of his personality and his humanity sort of transcended everything else. He was a good hater. And I'm sure that he loved just as intensely as he hated. I remember that when I first came, if Charles de Tolnay was anywhere near, walking on Nassau Street, each of them would go a different way, just so that they wouldn't have to encounter each other.

SMITH: Did he explain this to you at all? Did he give you any of the history?

HECKSCHER: No.

SMITH: You just knew that he didn't like Charles de Tolnay?

HECKSCHER: Oh yes, it was quite obvious. Probably it had reached me

somehow that this was so. Panofsky was a terribly witty man, and I would say the most brilliant person I've ever met. He was thoroughly the scholar, even to the end.

SMITH: Even to the end?

HECKSCHER: Even to the end.

SMITH: What do you mean by that?

HECKSCHER: Well, even when he was very ill, he would still want to reach out for a book and check something that he was thinking about.

[Tape I, Side Two]

SMITH: You had mentioned that you were told that he was a very difficult person to work with, so that means that the staff at the Institute did share their impressions of people.

HECKSCHER: Well, I don't know about the staff, but the person who indicated this to me was the personnel manager who interviewed me initially.

SMITH: Mrs. Barnett.

HECKSCHER: Mrs. Barnett. Obviously she had gotten this impression through the procession of people that he had had before.

SMITH: Did the staff at the Institute talk about the people they worked for? Were there comparisons made?

HECKSCHER: No, I think they didn't compare, but if something funny

happened, one secretary would probably say something about her boss, you know, that sort of thing.

SMITH: You only worked for one person?

HECKSCHER: In the beginning I only worked for Panofsky. He was terribly honest about what he called his "fallow period." Where other professors who had private secretaries would take it for granted that during their fallow period, well, the secretary could read or do whatever, Panofsky, being very precise about these things, simply went to the administration and said he didn't need me full time during that period. But he never hesitated to pull me back again when he wanted me full time, which put me in a terribly difficult position, because by that time I had been assigned to a different person. So I would spend the mornings and part of the afternoon with Panofsky, which left very little time to work with the other person. And when it suited Panofsky he'd pull me right back [full time]. I was squeezed between the two of them, and I found that very difficult.

SMITH: How did you handle that? Was that something you could talk about with him?

HECKSCHER: I'll tell you, the person who suffered along with me was the second person that I worked for, Felix Gilbert, the historian. Since he had come into the Institute after Pan, and possibly also because of his own personality, he played second fiddle to Pan. I was in the position where I wanted to get Pan's

work out of the way every single day, because that's the way he liked it. He called it a "fallow period," but the fallowness changed and we couldn't just shove Felix Gilbert aside, so that part was not easy.

SMITH: Was Panofsky rank conscious, do you think? Did he seem to be aware of both his social distinction and his intellectual distinction?

HECKSCHER: He was very aware of social distinctions. And it's interesting, I never really had a deep discussion with him about this because I didn't want to push things too far, but very often he would say he ate pheasant as a child. I got the feeling he was a very spoiled child, but I also got the feeling that he came out of his mother's womb with an absolutely brilliant mind. I never got much of a feeling about his father, and not much about his mother, except I got the impression that she gave him everything he wanted. But this business of eating pheasant was a status thing, which he was sort of letting me know about. I never trusted it.

SMITH: You didn't quite believe him?

HECKSCHER: I didn't trust it because it seemed tasteless to me; in other words, somebody who was at ease with that wouldn't throw it out. It was as if he was conferring on himself something that he wanted rather than something that was actual. This again is conjecture on my part. I never quite swallowed it, and there were other little indications. I can't give you specifics on those, but this

business of eating pheasant, always, in conjunction with some of the other things made me wonder how he felt.

SMITH: Particularly at the Institute, but also in the field of art history you wind up socializing to a certain degree with extremely wealthy people. Wealthy Americans.

HECKSCHER: Well, I think that having been born in Germany— For instance, everybody called Oppenheimer "Robert." You never called him "Bob," but, again, although this was a very admirable man and very well educated, you did get the feeling that Pan sort of kowtowed to him.

SMITH: Oh, really?

HECKSCHER: Not for any great advantage that he would gain from it; this is not what I want to imply, but it was sort of, you know—

SMITH: A recognition of a superiority of some sort?

HECKSCHER: Yes, exactly; there was that in him.

SMITH: When you mention that it was like talking to Henry James, there is an element of preciousness and stuffiness that's associated with that.

HECKSCHER: Well, yes, but in Pan's case I wouldn't say that it was precious or stuffy. My impression is that his English had really come to him mostly via reading rather than conversing. It's not that he couldn't converse, he certainly could, but the basic English that he commanded came from literature, and this is

what was coming out when he spoke to you. So [he would use expressions like] "that is to say," and there were all these meandering sentences. I'll never forget Edith Wharton's description of Henry James giving directions to somebody who asked how to get from here to there; this is the way Pan's sentences would be.

SMITH: Was he open about his personal life, his problems and concerns?

HECKSCHER: Never. I don't think that Pan had too many personal problems, I really don't. Well, I mean, no human being is without personal problems, but I don't think that Pan, or even his generation, or most German men would ever admit that they had problems.

SMITH: So he was always cool, in other words?

HECKSCHER: Well, I don't know if I would call him "cool." He was a highly emotional man.

SMITH: How did he express his emotions? I mean we're talking, I suppose, about the office [environment], but did you get to know him socially, outside of the office?

HECKSCHER: Well yes, he invited me to the house and I met his wife, Dora, and I think during some of those lectures that he gave in New York when she wasn't up to going, at certain points I sat with her or I stayed with her. She would say to me, "I can always tell when he's in love, from his walk." So, clearly, he had his little dalliances or his infatuations and she was very much

aware of them—intensely so because she was, I guess, eight years older than he. He loved music and he introduced me to certain things in music that I had never heard of.

SMITH: Such as?

HECKSCHER: Well, Wilhelm Friedemann Bach was one of them. At that point I only knew [Johann Sebastian] Bach. And then there were Mozart pieces that were almost like late Beethoven, and he would give these to me as gifts. He would first find out if I had it, and then he would give it to me as a gift, mostly at Christmastime.

SMITH: Did you get to know Dora fairly well?

HECKSCHER: Oh, yes, fairly well. I wouldn't say "well."

SMITH: Was she a sad person, would you say?

HECKSCHER: No, I didn't feel that she was a sad person. I think this explains it. When Dora died Pan called me up in the afternoon, after the service was over and the sons had gone and he was alone. This was after the funeral service at which Millard Meiss had spoken. He was feeling very lonely, and he called me and I went there, and we had tea together. He talked about Dora to me, and he said, "You know, she never knew if people liked her." And I thought, "How sad. I wonder if he's aware of what he's telling me." How could he not be aware? But he had such an overpowering mind that I can understand that Dora

felt dwarfed by him, even though you wouldn't be able to say that this was so if you saw them together. But I can see that she might very easily have felt, "Do they like me for myself, or is it because I'm Panofsky's wife?" So, in that sense, that was kind of sad to me, but I don't think Dora herself was sad. She had a very active mind herself, she contributed, and they had what I thought was a very good marriage, of very long standing, and he was utterly lost when she died.

SMITH: Did the "fallow period" that you mentioned coincide with the period after her death?

HECKSCHER: No. He was terribly lonely after her death, and then Gerda appeared on the scene, and one day he came in and he said he was still getting consolation letters and he felt awful because he was contemplating marrying Gerda. And I said, "Well, it's a compliment to Dora in a way. If you've been happily married you want to get married again. If you've been unhappily married you don't want to get married again." Anyway, I think he married her within eight months after Dora's death. I don't think it was a happy marriage. This is my opinion. I think she married him for his name, and I think he knew it in the end. So that to me is a very sad episode.

When I first met Pan, he said he would never set foot into Germany. Well, suddenly there was this *Pour le mérite*, and here he was married to an ethnic German. I think a part of him must have wanted this recognition in

Germany so that one can't say that this was Gerda's fault. However, had he not married Gerda I don't think that he would have gone to Germany. And of course he was terribly plagued by having gone.

SMITH: Really?

HECKSCHER: Oh, yes. He felt that he had betrayed his people. Now, everybody knew that Pan was Jewish, but he wasn't glaringly Jewish in the sense that I don't think that it mattered very much to him; he'd probably not given it that much thought, although he was Jewish. And I think he felt very guilty for having gone there. He was plagued by this, and I think Gerda realized this. But she really didn't know Pan. They were married for two years, but she was adulating him—this is my opinion—and if you adulate somebody to that extent you can't know them. So she decided that he would be buried as a Jew. Pan believed in having some kind of ceremony, because I remember that when Ernst Kantorowicz died, Pan came back from that saying, "Kantorowicz died and he wanted no ceremony—no service or anything." He said, "One has to put a period to these things. We all congregated at my house, and we talked about him and that was our service. One has to have some kind of service, to put the period there." So I guess Harold Cherniss and Ralph Giesey and a few of the other friends simply congregated in Pan's house. They had the service in either Pan's house or Cherniss's house, I forget which it was now. When Dora died,

she was cremated, and the service was given by Millard Meiss. He said something about Dora, which has been published I think. I think Pan probably thought it would be the same for himself. But Gerda decided that he was so plagued by having betrayed his people—and he never would have spoken in these terms before this *Pour le mérite* thing—she had what turned out to be a beautiful service at the Jewish Center here, where a rabbi officiated and he did a beautiful job. I think this was a total misunderstanding on Gerda's part, but it doesn't really matter.

SMITH: Well, services are always for the survivors. Did he talk much about his children? I guess Wolfgang Panofsky is, if anything, even more prominent in his field than his father was.

HECKSCHER: Well, you've probably heard this story about the Panofsky boys—the dumb Panofsky and the smart Panofsky. One graduated from Princeton with a 99 average and the other one had a 98 average. [laughter] All I can tell you is that whenever Pan knew that his sons were coming, the dictation would be shortened so that he could get home on time, and there was an excitement in him. As I say, he had a very warm and emotional personality, so he loved those boys. I think that Dora tended to hide her feelings. I never saw the sons together with their parents, so I can't comment about that, but when I was quite pregnant, and this was rather touching to me, Pan said to me one day,

"How does it feel when the baby kicks?" I said, "Well, I feel as if I've thrown out my fishing rod, and I've got a nibble." But I thought it was so curious that he should ask me how it felt, when Dora had gone through two pregnancies. My impression was that he'd never asked her. I remember when I probably was in my eighth month and quite large, I was at their house, and Dora said, "Ach, it's so ugly! Pregnancy is so ugly!"

SMITH: Dora said this?

HECKSCHER: It was like a rejection of being a woman, as far I was concerned. She dressed in mannish clothing to the point where even the shoes were wing-tip shoes. I don't know where she got these shoes because they weren't wing-tip shoes with heels. They were flat and they must have been bought in a man's shop or custom made. She wore suits and a necktie and her hair was bobbed short, which of course in her time was the German intellectual woman's hairdo. But she was a very delicate person, actually, and probably she could have been very feminine if she had permitted herself. But, again, it seemed to me it might have been partly competition with Pan.

But to me that was such a touching thing, I mean his asking me how it felt when the baby kicks. The obvious thing would be for a man to ask his wife that, even to touch her when the baby is kicking to know what it feels like as much as one can. After my child was born, Dora said to me, "Do you ever kiss your

daughter?" I said, "Of course I kiss my daughter." She said, "I never kissed my sons, and I think that's probably why they made good marriages." So that, in a sense, what was coming out was quite different from her true feelings about the boys. She was presenting to me a picture of a distancing woman, and yet the boys were very warm. That warmth came from that family. I'm sure that when they were together Dora must have shown a great deal of warmth to those boys. Whether she kissed them, I don't know, maybe she didn't, but to me, the very fact that out of the blue she asked me if I ever kissed my child was telling me that she was wanting to tell me something about herself, and she was underscoring it. To me it was an attitude that she didn't really hold; it was holding her, if you know what I mean.

SMITH: I think so, yes. Did Panofsky talk about his family at all, or his wife?

HECKSCHER: Not much.

SMITH: Of course they say it's difficult for men to talk about those things to other people.

HECKSCHER: Well, I think one has to remember, he probably did [talk about his family] with other people. In many ways he probably knew a lot about me and I knew a lot about him just because we saw each other every day and we couldn't hide certain things, [but] I think the fact that I was his secretary and the fact that he wasn't an American would probably be a barrier to his talking too

much about personal things.

SMITH: I have a couple more questions about his style of working with you. Did he explain his work to you or his positions? Did he try to give you background to what he was doing?

HECKSCHER: Sometimes, yes, he would, because he wanted me to understand what he was doing.

SMITH: Was he interested in your feedback, or just a response. I mean, was he curious about whether you thought something was interesting or not? Not that he would change what he was doing—

HECKSCHER: No. I know what you're getting at. Not at all. He was not trying to get feedback from me on his positions at all. What he was trying to do was to make it more interesting for me, just because he liked to do that. The other thing about Pan is that he never talked down to people. It was almost as if he conferred upon you, very often, an intelligence that you may not even have had, you know? So I would say that he had a tendency to assume that you were as bright—not as he was, but . . . I don't know, I'm not articulating this very well.

SMITH: I get what you're saying—he didn't dumb things down for people.

HECKSCHER: Not only that, but he assumed that you were understanding. So that he was conferring upon you an intelligence that you may not even have had.

He just took it for granted.

SMITH: That can be bewildering for some people, but it can also be liberating for others.

HECKSCHER: It can be very liberating, yes. But I think that this is all on the plus side.

SMITH: That implies that there's a negative side.

HECKSCHER: No, I didn't mean to imply that.

SMITH: Oh, okay. From what you've said, it sounds like Panofsky was pretty well organized. Is that true?

HECKSCHER: Absolutely, absolutely.

SMITH: So you didn't have to spend time searching for things; things didn't get lost and everything was in its place.

HECKSCHER: Absolutely.

SMITH: It sounds like he was also very concerned about being timely, at least from the correspondence. Was that also the case with his publications, that he had a pretty clear sense of schedule? When he did the dictation, how much time would he give you?

HECKSCHER: I don't know that he ever told me that he wanted it by evening. This may have been my own compulsion to clear my desk so that I would be ready the next day without having parts of it hanging over me from the day

before, because to keep up with him would have been very difficult if I had lost out on not being caught up each day.

SMITH: How clear were his instructions?

HECKSCHER: Very clear.

SMITH: Were there times when he had to criticize your work or suggest that you weren't doing things the way he thought they should be done?

HECKSCHER: He never did that.

SMITH: Oh, okay. I was curious what his style of criticism was.

HECKSCHER: Never. He never did that.

SMITH: Was he generous with praise? I mean, did he acknowledge when he thought you had done a good job, or was it taken for granted?

HECKSCHER: I can't say that it was taken for granted, but without underscoring it, either through a laugh or a gesture, he could make you feel that he was pleased.

SMITH: I did want to ask you about his famous sense of humor. And I know it's hard to remember specific jokes that he might tell, but maybe if you could just talk about the sorts of jokes that he might tell at the office.

HECKSCHER: Well, they were always the kind of jokes where there was a priest, a minister, and a rabbi, and it seems to me that the rabbi always ended up with the best line. [laughter]

SMITH: That's a nice way of putting it.

HECKSCHER: I mean, his wit was fantastic.

SMITH: Did he like to make puns?

HECKSCHER: No, it wasn't so much puns.

SMITH: What about mixing languages up. When he was telling a joke, would he sometimes switch from German to English to Latin?

HECKSCHER: No, I can't remember that. Once in a while, when he was dictating he would say, if he wanted to ask a favor of somebody in a letter, he would say, "Un juif ne va pas se promener." And then he'd laugh.

SMITH: Did you get to know who his closest associates were in Princeton, people who were really part of his inner circle?

HECKSCHER: Kantorowicz and Cherniss. I think those two were particularly close to him. I think Rosalie Green he knew very well, and Hetty Goldman, the archaeologist, who was the only woman faculty member at the Institute during that time. Panofsky would say, "I always say, Miss Goldman is the only gentleman here."

SMITH: The status of women at Princeton is notorious. Princeton was one of the most backward major universities in this [sense] from what I can figure out. I was just wondering how Rosalie Green fit in there?

HECKSCHER: Well, she was at the Index of Christian Art. I don't think she

was on the faculty.

SMITH: Were they off in a separate location, in McCormick Hall?

HECKSCHER: I think it was in McCormick Hall.

SMITH: Mrs. [Kurt] Weitzmann told me that for a period of time she had to go in through a separate entrance.

HECKSCHER: I don't know.

SMITH: Even though she had a Ph.D., women were not supposed to be present.

HECKSCHER: No. That I'd never heard.

SMITH: Well, they came in the thirties; maybe by the time you were here things had improved somewhat. But it sounds also as if the Institute was more male dominated than even most of academia was—certainly not Princeton, but other universities.

HECKSCHER: Well, certainly Hetty Goldman was the only woman, and it seems to me that that persisted until we had the School of Social Science, and it's relatively recently that the Institute has had women.

SMITH: If Pan's closest friends were Kantorowicz and Cherniss, who were his enemies? Do you know?

HECKSCHER: [Bernard] Berenson. He had no great love for Berenson.

SMITH: I guess Albert Friend must have died by the time you arrived.

HECKSCHER: Yes, he was probably gone by that time.

SMITH: What was the tenor of Panofsky's relationship with the history of art department of the university? Did he have good relations?

HECKSCHER: I think so, I think so.

SMITH: What about his relationships with the classicists at the Institute, like Homer Thompson. Was there a lot of give and take there? Much of Panofsky's work involved classical references, [and classics] is a field where there was a lot of new work going on and ideas were changing from his earlier education.

HECKSCHER: Well, of course they met at faculty meetings when they had to decide on who the members would be for the coming academic year. I think that Pan was friendly with Thompson, but I don't get the impression that they went from house to house and invited each other. I never got that impression.

SMITH: Did you get the impression that Panofsky was keeping up with current research in ancillary fields such as classical archaeology, or philosophy, or intellectual history—fields that pertained to what his primary subjects were, but were not at the core of it? I'm assuming he kept up with art history.

HECKSCHER: Well, yes, he certainly read the *Art Bulletin* and all of that.

SMITH: But there were other fields where there might be developments that were important to his own particular interests.

HECKSCHER: I really can't comment on that.

SMITH: I know that he might not have talked about this with you; it's more a

question of things popping up in casual ways—references to letters, or you may have seen something he was reading, that sort of thing.

HECKSCHER: No, I can't—

SMITH: Don't worry if you can't recall; it's just one of the things I wondered about. Did Panofsky discuss art with you? Did you ever go to museums together?

HECKSCHER: No. He loved to go to the movies. In the earlier years when I worked for him, he and Dora would often go to the movies, but later on, I guess after her eye problems started, they weren't going to the movies anymore.

SMITH: Did he keep up with things like the French New Wave at that time or the latest American films? What were his personal tastes?

HECKSCHER: Well, he loved [Georges] Simenon, and if a movie had been made from a Simenon book he would go. I remember there was a Jean Gabin movie which was based on a Simenon novel and he went to see that. He really enjoyed the movies thoroughly. They often went to the Garden Theater, and that was really mostly an art movie house at that time, so that you were getting mostly the European films, also some American, but it was basically an art theater.

SMITH: Would he come into the office and talk about movies?

HECKSCHER: He would tell me what he saw, and he would discuss certain

things, yes.

SMITH: You had mentioned musical things that he introduced you to. What about poetry or literature? Did he bring things up in discussions?

HECKSCHER: Sometimes it came up in his writing to a friend. He loved Flaubert and Balzac. He would recommend books that he'd read and enjoyed to friends, but I forget the titles.

SMITH: Did you ever attend any social evenings at his house? Was that something that he and his wife did?

HECKSCHER: No, not evenings at the house. They entertained a lot, but it was mostly for lunch; it was not evening entertaining. They had Emma, who was marvelous and who had been with them for years and years. She was with Panofsky till his death. She herself is now dead. Emma Epps. She was an amazing woman and a marvelous cook. I think most of their guests they entertained for lunch, and Emma did the cooking. What was left over they ate in the evening, but their main meal was for lunch. Emma's cooking was superb. It was gourmet cooking.

SMITH: What was his home like? What were the furnishings and the art work? What did it say about his and Dora's personal lives?

HECKSCHER: Well, it was very European. One thing that I remember was a piece of furniture which I loved, and that was what I would call a *Kas*, or an

armoire-type thing. It was dark wood, and it was very old and the year was dug into it. Pan kept books and papers in that cupboard, and it was in the living room. Then he had an American painting, which was a moonscape. I don't know who the painter was.

SMITH: Was it like a Ryder-type painting?

HECKSCHER: No, it was one of the luminists, and I would say that it was a New England painting.

SMITH: So mid-nineteenth century?

HECKSCHER: Probably.

[Tape II, Side One]

SMITH: You were saying that he had this luminist painting.

HECKSCHER: Yes, I don't think that Pan was terribly interested in art works. He was interested in iconography. The meaning of that painting, or whatever it was, would add to his appreciation of it, but it wasn't the aesthetic appreciation; that only came with the knowledge of the iconography.

There was a fringe lamp which had a great deal of character. The strange thing was that the first time I went into the house it was exactly what I thought would be in the house, this fringe lamp. It was a very cozy, lived-in house. It wasn't a decorator's-type house, it wasn't a self-consciously beautiful interior, but it was very comfortable. The dining room was beautiful. They had a

grandfather clock, which I think was European, and Pan said that they had to have the dining room built to the height of that clock. The dining room was a very, very pleasant room because it had a lot of light. It had windows on two sides and overlooked the back garden. There was a painting in that dining room of two chairs, and it was as if two people were having a conversation. That was a painting that I really liked. Who had done it I don't know. It may have been a friend for all I know, but it was very nice. The rooms upstairs were quite beautiful, the proportions. It was a house made for their comfort, and it housed what they wanted. Pan had a study right off the living room, one wall of which was just window. He had a great fondness for dogs, and there was an Irish setter who would always come, and Pan would stop everything and say, "Look." At one point, when he'd become ill, I went to the house to take dictation, and he stopped everything to show me this dog. He loved dogs, and Dora was always jealous of his dogs.

SMITH: Did he do his writing at home or in the office?

HECKSCHER: He did it at home. And of course the letters that were answered were not written at all; they just flowed out.

SMITH: What about the footnotes? Would he give them to you, or did you have to just piece them together?

HECKSCHER: I think that the footnotes that he had were run into his own text

the way his secretary before me had done, but he knew where those footnotes were.

SMITH: So he would read along the text and say,"Footnote 27"?

HECKSCHER: He would say,"Footnote 27" and then I would put "Footnote 27" on the text and circle it, because it was easy to find that way, and then he would give me footnote 27 right then and there. In other words, he didn't wait till the text was finished and then just give me a string of footnotes. He gave me the footnotes as they occurred and I would just switch pads and put footnote 27 into the footnote pad.

SMITH: To your knowledge, did he ever check the footnote references, or did you check them from time to time?

HECKSCHER: I never checked the references. Presumably he had checked them before, and he probably checked them after it was ready to be sent to the publisher.

SMITH: Okay, so he gave you the footnotes all worked out.

HECKSCHER: Yes. Now, I'm sure that I checked it when I was going over it and editing it, checking the footnotes against the text. There were times when something would come up and it had to be corrected. Maybe the footnote didn't quite match the text, you know, that could happen.

SMITH: What about the way he dressed, his sartorial style? You said that

Princeton is a very casual place.

HECKSCHER: It is a very casual place.

SMITH: But was he casual?

HECKSCHER: Yes, he was, I would say so, unless he were going to New York to give a lecture. He mostly wore a tweed jacket with the elbow patches and gray trousers very often. He had a tweed coat, and he would wear a hat. It seemed to me that it was the fedora type, if that's the right [term].

SMITH: Did he always wear a tie?

HECKSCHER: He did, and it was very European because if the shirt were a striped shirt, he would have, let's say, a tie that was maroon, [with] patterns. I often thought, "This is so European. No American would mix a striped shirt with that kind of tie." And of course he would wear a vest-type sweater over his shirt, and it was always tucked into the trousers, not like an American who would wear it outside; it was tucked in.

SMITH: Was wearing a tie at the office something everybody would do?

HECKSCHER: No, but he always wore a tie. And he had this odd habit, when he was thinking, of putting his index finger at the outer edge of his eye and making his eyeball protrude in a somewhat alarming way; that was a very typical thing.

SMITH: Did you get a sense of what his system was for preserving his research

notes, and how those related to his drafts? Did he have index cards?

HECKSCHER: He had index cards and he had certain references that he always referred to. He had these metal, probably slightly larger than three-by-five twin metal files, and all his references would be in that.

SMITH: Did he have a slide library in his office?

HECKSCHER: No. He might have kept those at home, because certainly he used slides when he lectured.

SMITH: Were there unfinished projects that were occupying him at the time of his last illness?

HECKSCHER: I don't know that they were occupying him, but, you know, Dora and he used to go to Maine. Camden is where they often went, and he would usually have a graduate student or somebody drive them because it was a long drive for him.

SMITH: Did he know how to drive?

HECKSCHER: Oh yes, but that was a longish drive for him, so he would usually have somebody drive him and then that person would bring them back again. But I remember one year while they were in Camden he was working on the Flight into Egypt, and his notes got burned. There was a fire in the hotel room and the notes got burned and I remember the edges. He still had pieces of it when he came back, but he never did anything with it after that, and that would

have been very interesting.

SMITH: So it was too daunting for him to reconstruct?

HECKSCHER: Well, I don't know. I think he just had too many other things that he was working on, because he was the type of person who I think could very easily have reproduced it. He had a photographic mind; I mean, nothing escaped. His memory was phenomenal.

SMITH: Did he smoke cigarettes?

HECKSCHER: Yes, he did. He was told not to, I guess. I was a very heavy smoker at the time, and I smoked incessantly while I was taking dictation. I would write with my right hand and be smoking and puffing away with the left. Pan had his ashtray and I had mine. But there came a time when I think the doctor told him that he shouldn't be smoking, and I think in the end he wasn't; he had given it up. He would occasionally, however, snatch one of the larger butts from my ashtray and light it.

SMITH: In terms of alcohol, was he moderate?

HECKSCHER: Absolutely moderate, absolutely moderate. I think that he had ulcers, and I don't know that they bothered him particularly, but he would very often have whisky which he would mix with cream or milk because it took the edge off. He also enjoyed wine very much. At those lunches that they had they always had very good wines.

SMITH: Now, he did have a reputation for being "a ladies' man," if you want to say it politely, or "a womanizer"—I don't know. When you met him he was in his sixties. Was he still sort of "fooling around," as it were? Was this something that you were aware of?

HECKSCHER: I can't say. I may have been dense, but I can't say that I was particularly aware of this at all. As I said, Dora said that she could always tell when he was in love. But the one person that I thought perhaps he had a crush on looked very much like Dora.

SMITH: That's interesting.

HECKSCHER: German, same haircut, same type of face. Gerda didn't fall into that [mold], although Gerda's a very good looking woman I think.

SMITH: Well, I'm coming to the end [of my questions], but I wanted to ask what you continued to do after Panofsky passed away, and then how you came to meet your husband. You must have been socializing to some degree with the Panofsky circle because you met Bill through Panofsky, right?

HECKSCHER: Well I did, because, as I say, Pan said, "I notice that Heckscher is working way into the night, and since I'm going through this fallow period I wondered if you could help him." Well, of course I had met "Heckscher" at this point and I found him most attractive as a person. I had felt this way even before meeting him because of the letters that Pan wrote to Bill and Bill wrote to Pan.

So Heckscher had made an impression on me through his correspondence with Pan, and Pan decided that I should work only part time for him because he had his letters to type every day, but he didn't have a project at that point. When he suggested that I work for Heckscher, I didn't really want to.

SMITH: Oh because you already had a sort of—

HECKSCHER: Well, I found him very attractive and I didn't want any emotional involvement at that point in my life. So I tried to torpedo it by saying, "I think you'd better check this with the secretary of the School of Historical Studies, because it might not be a very diplomatic thing to do at this point without consulting with her." So that's what Pan did, but there was no escaping it, so I ended up doing work for William. I guess that was the beginning, and it was many years later, in 1973, that we got married.

SMITH: Did you see Bill in a Panofsky social circle setting?

HECKSCHER: No, Panofsky never knew that William and I had any relationship. When Pan was dying William came and took care of him. William was at Duke at that time. And of course I appeared at the house at the same time, but Pan never knew anything about our relationship.

SMITH: Now, you continued at the Institute after Panofsky died?

HECKSCHER: As I said, Pan decided that he didn't need me full time, and so when Felix Gilbert was elected to become a faculty member, I divided my time

between the two [of them]. When Pan died I worked only for Gilbert. I retired from the Institute after Gilbert died.

SMITH: So you decided not to go on to a third person?

HECKSCHER: I was sixty-three when I decided that I would work only part time for Felix. At first I thought I would retire at sixty-two, but I wasn't quite ready at sixty-two. At sixty-three I approached Gilbert and told him that I had really felt the time for me to retire had come, and I thought he should think about it very carefully. I told him I would be willing to continue working for him on a part-time basis, but not full time, and this would mean that he wouldn't get the services that he was getting before. He decided that he wanted me to continue with him, and then he became ill. It was hardly a year and a half later that he died. I guess Gilbert died in 1991, yes.

SMITH: And then you retired?

HECKSCHER: I retired completely at that point. I worked for his wife at the Institute for about five months, just to get his papers in order, and then I retired completely.

SMITH: What are the differences, if any, between being a secretary for an academic person and working in the private business world? I know the State Department's not private, but it was general office kind of work. Are there major distinctions?

HECKSCHER: Well, the major distinction between the State Department and working here was a question of pressure. At the State Department you are dealing with things that are happening at the moment, and very often you have to work overtime and under tremendous pressure, whereas here it was a totally different thing.

SMITH: Were there ever publishing deadlines?

HECKSCHER: No, there was never that kind of pressure. Working at the Institute I think was less strenuous, but the Institute was unique and I don't know that it's the same as it was when I left.

SMITH: To what degree is there a Princeton community that you are part of?

HECKSCHER: I think it was a very difficult thing to get into a group in Princeton; it's not easy. I made friends very slowly. But I think it's a funny town. I remember when I first came to Princeton I thought, "These people are dead. They're all dead. They've gotten their nuggets in a different country. They go to Europe, they dig up things, and then they're in their houses writing, and there's just something very dead about them." But of course I'd come from a place where everything [was so] immediate; it was quite a change.

SMITH: And you obviously needed to get away from "the immediate."

HECKSCHER: And here I am. What is it . . . thirty-seven years that I've been here.

INDEX

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 25
Bach, Wilhelm Friedemann, 25
Balzac, Honoré de, 38
Beethoven, Ludwig van, 25
Berenson, Bernard, 35

Cherniss, Harold, 27, 34, 35

Epps, Emma, 38

Flaubert, Gustave, 38

Gabin, Jean, 37
Giesey, Ralph, 27
Gilbert, Felix, 21, 46–47
Goldman, Hetty, 34, 35
Green, Rosalie, 34–35

Heckscher, William (husband), 11, 45–46

James, Henry, 8, 23–24
Jung, Carl, 7

Kantorowicz, Ernst, 27, 34, 35

McCormick Hall (Princeton), 35
Meiss, Millard, 25, 28
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 25

Oppenheimer, Robert, 23

Panofsky, Dora, 24–30, 37, 38, 40, 43, 45
Panofsky, Erwin: and cinema, 37; facility with languages, 8–9, 23–24; first meeting with, 2– 3; home of, 38–40; lecturing style, 13–14; literary and musical tastes, 25, 37; memory, 44; personal characteristics, 42, 44–45; personal library, 18; sense of humor, 3, 7, 33–34; sons of, 28–30; working methods, 5–6, 9–10, 14–15, 18, 21, 41, 43, 49
Panofsky, Gerda, 15, 26–28, 45
Panofsky, Wolfgang, 28
Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic, 16, 17

Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art, 5–6, 11

Schmeckebier, Laurence, 7
Simenon, Georges, 37

Thompson, Homer, 36
Tolnay, Charles de, 19
Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini, 11, 13, 16

Weitzmann, Mrs. Kurt, 35
Wharton, Edith, 24

THE BOOKBINDERY LTD.
215 North Fifth Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104